®JS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

Case 2:15-cv-0610@ MSL @ OO WIERT S.H File of 11/12/15 Page 1 of 14

APPENDIX H

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provide by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS JOSEPH D. CASEY					DEFENDANTS BLATT, HASENMILLER, LEIBSKER™ & MOORE, LLC							
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff PHILADELPHIA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Cary L. Flitter, Esq.,, Flitter Lorenz, P.C., 450 N. Narberth Avenue, Suite 101, Narberth, PA 19072, (610) 822-0782					County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.							
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff												
U.S. Government Plaintiff		☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		PTF Citize		y) DEF 1 Incorporated or 1 of Business In Th			Defendan PTF ☐ 4	t) DEF □4		
□ 2	U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	of Parties in Item III)			□2 □ 2		Principal Place Another State	□ 5	□ 5		
					oreign Country	☐ 3 ————	☐ 3 Foreign Nation		☐ 6 ————	□ 6 ======		
IV. N	CONTRACT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only		EOD	TRYTHDRAMMALL TO	1 .	DANKEDINGS	Common or	DA 704 FFFF			
120 130 140 150 & 6 151 152 & 6 153 & 6 160 & 6 190	Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault. Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product	PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	61	O Agriculture O Other Food & Drug To Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 O Liauor Laws O R.R. & Truck O Airline Regs. O Occupational Safety/Health O Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act O Labor/Mgmt. Relations O Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act O Railway Labor Act O Other Labor Litigation 1 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	422	BANKRUPTCY 2 Appeal 28 USC 158 3 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 OPERTY RIGHTS 3 Copyrights 4 Patent 5 Trademark CIAL SECURITY HIA (1395ff) 10 Black Lung (923) 10 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 10 SSID Title XVI 10 RSI (405(g)) 10 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 11 IRS—Third Party 126 USC 7609	OTHER S 400 State Reag 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and 450 Commerce 450 Commerce 470 Racketeer Corrupt Org 480 Consumer 490 Cable/Sat 810 Selective: 850 Securities, Exchange 875 Customer 12 USC 34: 890 Other Stat 891 Agricultur 892 Economic 893 Environme 894 Energy Al 895 Freedom c Act 900Appeal of Under Equa to Justice 950 Constitutie State Statut	portionm Banking I Banking Influence ganization Credit TV Service (Commod Challenge 10 utory Act al Acts Stabilizat ental Matt location A of Informa	ent d and is ities/ e ions tion Act ters Act a		
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) □ Removed from □ Remanded from □ Reopened Transferred from □ Appeal to District □ Multidistrict □ Multidistrict □ Judge from Magistrate State Court Appellate Court Reopened State Court Reopened State Court Reopened State Court Reopened State Court State Court State Court Reopened State Court State Court State Court Reopened State Court S												
VI. CA	AUSE OF ACTION		under which you are filin : FDCPA 15 USC § 1692		not cite jurisdictional st	tatutes	unless diversity):					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23					DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint JURY DEMAND: \(\text{Ves} \text{INO}. \)							
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD												
	Nov. 9, 20	015	DISTRIBUTE OF ATTOR		they L	fu	Ш					
RECE		MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDG	BE				

Case 2:15-cv-06106-BMS Document 1 Filed 11/12/15 Page 2 of 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

APPENDIX F

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF P assignment to appropriate calendar.	ENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FOR	M to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of
Address of Plaintiff: <u>8645 Steeple Drive</u>	Philadelphia, PA 19128	
Address of Defendant: 10 South LaSalle	Street, Suite 2200, Chicago, IL 60603	
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	: 8645 Steeple Drive, Philadelphia, PA 19	128
Use Reverse Side For Additional Space)		
	nental corporate party with any parent corpora tement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P	tion and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? 7.1(a) Yes \(\subseteq \text{No } \subseteq \)
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation	on possibilities?	Yes 🗌 No 🛛
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:		
Case Number:	Judge	Date Terminated:
	is answered to any of the following question	
1. Is this case related to property include	ed in an earlier numbered suit pending or wi	thin one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes □ No ☒
2. Does this case involve the same issue action in this court?	of fact or grow out of the same transaction	as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated Yes ☐ No ☒
3. Does this case involve the validity or	infringement of a patent already in suit or an	y earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously
terminated action in this court?		Yes □ No ⊠
I, Pursuant to Local Civil	ion Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 ARBITRATION CE (Check appropria , counsel of record do hereby certif I Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the 100.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	ate Category)
	tary damages is sought	
DATE:	Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.
NOTE: A trial	de novo will be a trial by jury only	if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the with as noted above. DATE: Nov 9, 2015 CIV.609 (4/03)	hin case is not related to any case now per Attorney-at-Law	ading or within one year previously terminated action in this court except 35047 Attorney I.D.

APPENDIX I

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

v.

: CIVIL ACTION

JOSEPH D. CASEY

BLAII	, HASENMILLER, LIEBSKER & MOORE, LLC : NO.					
plaintif filing tl side of designa the pla	ordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, confirmally complete a case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regardation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and intiff and all other parties, a case management track designation form specifying the hat defendant believes the case should be assigned.	ne tim he rev ding l serv	ne o verse said			
SELEC	CT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:					
(a)	Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. §2241 through §2255.	()			
(b)	Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits					
(c)	Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	(X)			
(d)	Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.	()			
(e)	Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases)	()			
(f)	Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.	()			
NoV Date	9,2015 Cary L. Flitter Attorney at Law Attorney for Plaintiff	-:				
610-822 Felepho (Civ.660)	one Fax Number E-Mail Address	Į	_			

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JOSEPH D. CASEY 8645 Steeple Drive Philadelphia, PA 19128

Plaintiff.

VS.

CIVIL ACTION

BLATT, HASENMILLER, LEIBSKER & MOORE, LLC 10 South LaSalle Street Suite 2200 Chicago, IL 60603

NO.

Defendant

COMPLAINT

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

- 1. This is a lawsuit against a national debt collection law firm, "Blatt" for malicious prosecution and violation of the requirements of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").
- 2. In November, 2014, Blatt sent an initial collection letter seeking \$4,820.51 to Joseph Casey for a debt he did not incur and did not owe. Casey immediately disputed the debt in writing, advising Blatt it was not his. Rather than properly verify the debt as the FDCPA requires, Blatt sued Casey. After suit, Casey again advised Blatt that he owed no such debt. Rather than verify the debt, obtain proof or drop the case, Blatt continued to press the lawsuit in court. Only because Casey showed up at Court to defend himself on the day for trial did Blatt then deign to withdraw the case, although without prejudice.
- 3. The filing of the lawsuit after being put on written notice and the continued prosecution of the case which was later admitted to be baseless as to Casey was malicious and

violated the protective provisions of the FDCPA.

II. JURISDICTION

- 4. Subject matter jurisdiction of this Court arises under 15 U.S.C. §1692k, actionable through 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1337.
- 5. Venue is proper as Defendant regularly does business in this district and Plaintiff resides in this district.

III. PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is Joseph D. Casey ("Plaintiff" or "Casey") is an adult individual and a consumer who resides in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania at the address captioned.
- 7. Defendant Blatt, Hasenmiller, Leibsker & Moore, LLC ("Defendant" or "Blatt") is believed to be an Illinois limited liability company a principal place of business at the address captioned.
- 8. Defendant regularly engages in the collection of consumer debts using the mails and telephone.
 - 9. Defendant regularly attempts to collect consumer debts alleged to be due another.
- 10. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is contemplated in the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

IV. STATEMENT OF CLAIM

11. On or about November 11, 2014, Defendant Blatt send an initial collection letter to Casey seeking to collect on a consumer debt that was allegedly due to Bank of America, N.A., as successor in interest to FIA Card Services. A copy of the November 11, 2014 letter is attached hereto as Exhibit A (redacted in part per Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2).

- 12. The November 11, 2014 letter carried the validation notice provided by the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692g.
- 13. In response to the November 11, 2014 letter Casey wrote to Blatt on November 21, 2014. In that letter, Casey advised Blatt that he had received the November 11th demand letter on November 15, 2014, but that "I do not owe anyone anything. At the age of 74, I can state that I have paid all of my bills on time, every one of them. I never had a Bank of America or FIA [Card] Services account." Casey concluded "just so it is clear I dispute the existence of the debt that you wrote is mine. Please send all of the material I requested or that you stated you will provide within 30 days from the date of this letter."
 - 14. Casey's letter was mailed to Blatt, postage prepaid, on November 22, 2014.
- 15. Blatt did not respond to the demand for verification nor provide the validation information requested and required under 15 U.S.C. § 1692g. Blatt did not respond to Casey's dispute in a timely manner, nor at any time thereafter.
- 16. Instead, in January of 2015, Blatt commenced a civil suit against Casey in the Municipal Court of Philadelphia at Docket No. SC-15-01-29-6217.
- 17. In pursuit of that lawsuit, Blatt caused a process server to come to Casey's house to serve Casey with legal process in the above Municipal Court matter.
- 18. At the time of service, Casey advised the process server that while his name was Joseph Casey, he did not have any obligation whatever with the Bank of America.
- 19. Casey then proceeded to obtain credit reports from the credit bureaus. The credit reports provided some objective information that there was no record of an overdue or defaulted Bank of America account in the name of Plaintiff Casey.

3

- 20. On or about February 26, 2015, Casey sent into Municipal Court a Notice to Defend along with a request for a continuance. The continuance request was granted and the hearing rescheduled for May 18, 2015 in the Philadelphia Municipal Court.
- 21. After having received the credit report, Casey wrote a letter to Blatt's local attorney Syretta Martin. In the May 4, 2015 letter, Casey included a copy of his earlier November 21, 2014 dispute letter. Plaintiff reiterated that "I am not the Joseph Casey that is the subject of the referenced civil action. Please obtain a positive identifier ..." A copy of that letter is attached hereto as Exhibit "B".
- 22. Casey did not receive a response from Blatt in reply to his May 4, 2015 letter, either.
- 23. On May 18, 2015, Casey appeared in Court per the Summons. At that point in time, on the day of the scheduled trial, a Blatt attorney believed to be Christopher Allen Titus told Mr. Casey that Blatt had determined that someone else owed this money, not Casey, Plaintiff herein. Casey asked the Blatt lawyer why this took six months to resolve, why his previous letters went unanswered and why he had to come to Court to see to it that a default judgment was not entered against him.
- 24. Casey asked Blatt's lawyer to dismiss the case against him with prejudice. Blatt's lawyer refused.
- 25. Casey overheard Blatt's lawyer state that the "Joseph Casey we [Blatt] wanted is out of state" or words to that effect. Casey stated that he preferred to have the case proceed to trial rather than have the case against him dismissed merely "without prejudice." However, the Trial Commissioner did not require it, and the baseless collection suit against Casey was therefore marked on the docket as "withdrawn, without prejudice."

4

COUNT I (FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT)

- 26. Plaintiff repeats the allegations contained above as if the same were here set forth at length.
- 27. Under the FDCPA, a debt collector must "cease collection of a debt" on the date it receives a consumer's request for verification "until the debt collector obtains verification of the debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(b). The collector is liable if it continues to collect on the debt until it provides an appropriate verification.
- 28. Specifically, Blatt was barred from filing the instant Municipal Court lawsuit and from any other collection activity upon receipt of Casey's timely dispute letter and demand for verification.
- 29. In filing the instant suit, and in continuing to prosecute the dispute despite repeated advice that Casey did not owe this debt in any manner, Blatt violated the Act's prohibition on misrepresentation of the character, status or amount of the debt, § 1692e(2).
- 30. Blatt also violated the Act's prohibition on demanding any amount not due under contract or law. 15 U.S.C. § 1692f(1).
- 31. As a result of Defendant's actions and this baseless suit being filed and continued, Casey has suffered embarrassment, aggravation, loss of time and emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Joseph D. Casey demands judgment against Defendant Blatt, Hasenmiller, Leibsker & Moore, LLC for:

- (a) Actual damages;
- (b) Statutory damages;
- (c) Attorney's fees and costs; and

(d) Such other and further relief as the Court shall deem just and proper.

COUNT II STATE LAW - MALICIOUS PROSECUTION/ABUSE OF PROCESS

- 32. Plaintiff repeats the allegations contained above as if the same were here set forth at length.
- 33. The filing of the collection lawsuit and the proceeding of the matter to the day of trial was not warranted by fact or law. On the facts, Plaintiff Casey did not have any debt or obligation whatsoever to Blatt's client Bank of America. On the law, there was no contractual obligation and Blatt was barred by the FDCPA from further proceeding or filing suit until it verified the debt. 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(b).
- 34. The collection lawsuit represented an improper and abuse of use of the state court process.
- 35. Blatt had an improper purpose in both bringing the suit, after being put on notice and continuing to prosecute the suit until the day of trial, *i.e.*, to obtain judgment regardless of the legal liability. The filing of the suit, taking of the matter to the day of trial, the refusal to respond to repeat written requests for proof or clarification reflects a flagrant disregard for the law and an abuse of process.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Joseph D. Casey demands judgment against Defendant Blatt, Hasenmiller, Leibsker & Moore, LLC for:

- (a) Actual damages;
- (b) Statutory damages;
- (c) Attorney's fees and costs; and
- (d) Such other and further relief as the Court shall deem just and proper.

V. <u>JURY DEMAND</u>

Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 38, Plaintiff demands trial by jury as to all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted:

DATE: NOV 11,2015

CARY L. FLITTER ANDREW M. MILZ Attorneys for Plaintiff

FLITTER LORENZ, P.C. 450 N. Narberth Avenue, Suite 101 Narberth, PA 19072 (610) 822-0782

EXHIBIT "A"

Law Offices

Blatt, Hasenmiller, Leibsker & Moore LLC

10 South LaSalle St. * Suite 2200 * Chicago, Illinois 60603-1069 Phone 1-855-240-0826 * Fax 312-277-3809

11-11-14

JOSEPH D CASEY 8645 STEEPLE DR PHILADELPHIA PA 19128

RE:

Creditor:

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.

Customer:

JOSEPH D CASEY

Balance Owed:

\$4820.51

Previous Acct. #: XXXXXXXXXXXX7604

Current Acct. #: XXXXXXXXXXXXX6819

Dear JOSEPH D CASEY:

Our law firm has been retained by Bank of America, N.A., successor-In-interest to FIA Card Services (the "Bank"), in connection with the above-referenced account. Please be advised that the Bank intends to invoke its right to file a lawsuit against you.

If you notify this firm within thirty (30) days after your receipt of this letter, that the debt or any portion thereof, is disputed, we will obtain verification of the debt or a copy of the judgment, if any, and mail such verification or judgment to you. Upon your written request within the same thirty (30) day period mentioned above, we will provide you with the name and address of the original creditor, if different from the current creditor.

Unless you dispute the validity of the debt or any portion thereof within thirty (30) days after your receipt of this letter, we will assume that the debt is valid.

This communication is from a debt collector. We are attempting to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose.

Sincerely,

Blatt, Hasenmiller, Leibsker & Moore, LLC

This account is issued and administered by Bank of America, N.A., successor in interest to FIA Card Services, N.A.



Pennsylvania Illinois Indiana Michigan Arizona

EXHIBIT "B"

05/04/2015 16:15 FAX

TU CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Ø 001

का के वा भाव के के के का का के का # # # TX REPORT THE REPORT OF THE PERSON AND ADDRESS OF THE PERSON ADDRESS OF THE PERSON AND ADDRESS OF THE PERSON ADDRESS OF THE

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO

0029

CONNECTION TEL

912155643818

CONNECTION ID

ST. TIME

05/04 16:15

USAGE T PGS. SENT 00'25 2

OK

RESULT

JOSEPH D. CASEY 8645 STEEPLE DRIVE PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19128 MAY 4, 2015

Syretta J. Martin 1835 Market Street Suite 501 Philadelphia, PA 19103

Re: SC-15-01-29-6217

Dear Attorney Martin:

I am sending you a copy of a letter dated November 21, 2014 that I sent to your company's office in Illinois. I am not the Joseph Casey that is the subject of the referenced civil action. Please obtain a positive identifier (date of birth, social security number, or both) from your client, write to me advising that you have the information, and I will meet with you before the court date to conclusively show you that you caused a complaint to be served on the wrong Joseph Casey. This will save the Court valuable time. If you choose not to do this, ensure that you bring to Court the contract, including signature, and the date of birth and the social security number of the person who you claim owes this debt.

Please don't ignore this letter as you did to the letter dated February 14, 2015 I sent you concerning your failure to comply with the proper procedure in your failure to provide a self-addressed and stamped envelope with a copy of the complaint.

ery truly yours.

Joseph D. Casev

IDC/ms